

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JAMES C. WOODHAM,
Petitioner

v.

**SUPERINTENDENT OF SCI
HOUTZDALE, et al.,**
Respondents

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 1:25-cv-00575

(Judge Kane)

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 8th day of July 2025, after considering the petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 filed by pro se Petitioner James C. Woodham (“Woodham”) (Doc. No. 1), and for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum, **IT IS**

ORDERED THAT:

1. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. No. 1), to the extent that Woodham raises two (2) weight of the evidence claims, is **DISMISSED**;
2. Woodham shall **SHOW CAUSE** why the Court should not dismiss the remaining claims in his Section 2254 habeas petition because they are untimely filed;
3. Woodham has **thirty (30) days** from the date of this Order to file a written response to this Order with the Clerk of Court. Any written response shall focus on whether he timely filed his Section 2254 habeas petition as well as whether he is entitled to equitable tolling; and
4. If Woodham does not timely respond in accordance with paragraph three (3) of this Order, the Court will deem him to be unopposed to the dismissal the remaining claims in his habeas petition as untimely, and the Court will dismiss the petition in its entirety and direct the Clerk of Court to close this case.

s/ Yvette Kane
Yvette Kane, District Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania